

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 22 2007

F A X C O V E R**Date** June 22, 2007 **Number of pages (including cover):** 3**To** Olumide T. Ajibade-Akonai, Art Unit 2617**Company****Your File #** 302363.02**Tel** 571.272.6496**Fax** 571.273.8300**From** Jeffrey C. O'Neill, Ph.D./ Scott J. Gerwin**Direct dial** 617.646.8000**Our File #** M1103.70141US01ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS SENT: ☐ 1st Class Mail ☐ Overnight Mail ☐ Air Mail ☒ Not Sent**MESSAGE:**

This transmission contains confidential information intended for use only by the above-named recipient. Reading, discussing, distributing, or copying this message by anyone other than the named recipient, or his or her employees or agents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message to us at the address below via the U.S. Postal Service.

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES OF THIS TRANSMISSION OR IF ANY OF THE PAGES ARE ILLEGIBLE, PLEASE CALL 617.646.8000 IMMEDIATELY.

Wolf Greenfield Fax Number: 617.646.8646

Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C. | 600 Atlantic Avenue | Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000 | fax 617.646.8646 | www.wolfgreenfield.com

PATENTS TRADEMARKS COPYRIGHTS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS LITIGATION

JUN 22 2007

Application No. 10/680,549
Conf. No.: 5005

1

Docket No.: M1103.70141US00

Docket No.: M1103.70141US00
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Kamal Jain et al.
Serial No.: 10/680,549
Confirmation No.: 5005
Filed: October 7, 2003
For: MODEL AND METHOD FOR COMPUTING PERFORMANCE
BOUNDS IN MULTI-HOP WIRELESS NETWORKS
Examiner: A. O. Ajibade
Art Unit: 2617

PROPOSED AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Applicants wish to discuss the rejection of the pending claims over Chow. In the Response After Final Action dated April 26, 2007, Applicants argued that Chow does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 that recite "assigning to the edge a weight equal to a fraction of a maximum permissible noise at a link corresponding to the second vertex contributed by activity on the link corresponding to the first vertex" and "assigning to the edge a direction."

In the Advisory Action mailed June 6, 2007, the Examiner questioned whether the limitation that recites "assigning to the edge a weight equal to a fraction of a maximum permissible noise at a link corresponding to the second vertex contributed by activity on the link corresponding to the first vertex" can be construed so broadly as to read on Table 2 of Chow, which discloses assigning a value of "1" or "0" depending on whether two links interfere with each other. The Examiner's basis for this broad interpretation appears to be the previously pending but now canceled claim 3, which recited "assigning to the edge a weight of zero (0) if the links are not in conflict with each other; and assigning to the edge a weight of one (1) if the links are in conflict with each other." Applicants would like to discuss the Examiner's view as to whether this interpretation of the claim language is proper.

1200070.1

JUN 22 2007

Application No. 10/680,549
Conf. No.: 5005

2

Docket No.: M1103.70141US00

Applicants would also like to discuss the Examiner's view as to whether Chow discloses the limitation of claim 1 that recites "assigning to the edge a direction."

If the Examiner has any questions in advance of the telephone conference, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Scott J. Gerwin
Registration No.: 57,866
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000

Docket No. M1103.70141US00

Date: 6/22/07

1209070.1